

Robert F. Wallcut, General Agent.

TERMS: \$2 per annum, in advance.
All communications to be made, and all letters
relating to the business of the paper are to be
directed (not sent) to the General Agent.
Six copies will be sent to one address for the
DOLLAR, if payment be forwarded in advance.
Advertisements making less than a square in-
serted three times for 75 cts.—one square for \$1 00.

Financial Committee.—FRANCIS JACKSON, ELIAS GRAY,
LOUISA, EDWARD QUINN, SAMUEL PIERCE, W. G.
BELL, PHILLIPS. [This Committee is responsible only
for the financial economy of the paper—not for any
of its contents.]

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

VOL. XX. NO. 11.

The Liberator.

From the Journal of Commerce.

THE HUNGARIAN EXILES TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES.

America! the remnants of the oldest free nation
of Europe have landed on the hospitable shores of
the free Union of North America.

There are but two kinds of nations on earth; the
free and the enslaved. Hungary was from the out-
set a free land.

Despots and usurpers combined together, and
placed the whole force of their respective States,
each at the disposal of the other, for mutual support.
The great current of events sweeps on, and in this day
of public opinion, no one man and no ten men can
change or sensibly warp its general set.

Free people have seen, alas! too late, their error
in treating each other with indifference; the result
of which has been, that for the last sixty years, all
the free States of Europe have fallen a prey to ty-
ranny.

Hungary resisted the conquest. Through the
course of nine centuries, and trials such as no other
people have experienced, it maintained its liberty
and independence.

Not to mention its position as the rampart of Chris-
tianity, and its mighty struggles with the Turks,
resulting from that position, it has, within the last
three hundred years, five times measured its strength
with that of Austria, in successful defence of its
rights.

With God and justice on our side, we have shown
by a hundred victories, in the war of 1848-1849,
that we can attempt to enslave Hungary with im-
punity.

We, and with us the right cause of the other people
of Europe, have come to this contest victorious, if
the faithful governments of Europe had not suffered
Russia to add forth her armies against us, and if
the Northern despots had not bribed that man
to become a Judas to the land, whose children had
entrusted him with its defence.

Overwhelmed by the barbarians of the North, be-
trayed by George, who might have been the Wash-
ington of his country, there was nothing left for us
but to lay down our arms—though not conquered,
yet unequal to the danger of our doubting of the
future, which we gladly know is in the hands of God,
we save the strength of our heroic children for that
country and the happier future that must come,
and for the present yield to the necessity of the mo-
ment.

Hungary's sons cannot, will not, be slaves!
America! some of Washington and Franklin!
you cannot have forgotten the sympathy that
was extended to your fathers on the part of Europe
in their heroic struggle. You will not regard with
indifference martyrs of freedom, who have always look-
ed upon your growth with joy, and attended it with
prayers for your continued prosperity.

Nor will you refuse a kind reception and hospita-
ble rights to men who have willingly sacrificed all
that is dear to man on earth, for the sake of liberty.
We, the rightful owners of the land of our fathers,
wander homeless over the ocean, while the conspiring
usurpers trample on the free inheritance of our free
fathers; we come to America with the deep grief of
mourning in our hearts.

Our sons have poured out their blood on the battle-
field; our wives and little children have been driven
from their homes, persecuted and separated from
each other; many of us have left behind fathers and
mothers, in misery, or even in the chains of tyranny;
many have no knowledge of the fate of their nearest
to them; and to none of us is it granted to lighten
our grief by weeping among the ruins over the graves
of our dear country.

Thus do we, the unfortunate, come to happy, free
America. Americans! you have already shown us
your generous sympathy. The encouraging voice
of your sympathy reached us over the sea, and the
warm grasp of American hands has been a welcome
to us, and we thank you that the free American honors
the free Hungarian.

Thank you for this. May America calmly and
safely advance to that greatness which Providence
has appointed for her!

As we step upon your hospitable shores, we reach
to you our hands in hearty greetings. We hope for
a friendly return; for a reception such as no free
people gives to another. We count upon such sym-
paties as must exist between free men who mutually
honor each other.

We come to you to seek rest here from the labors
of battle; to find alleviation for our sorrow and ca-
lidity; to wait the issue of the struggle which has
been in reserve for the restoration of our country.

We look with confidence for a hospitable recep-
tion in this generous land, that may prove to the ty-
rants of the earth that free people are closely bound
to each other, and firmly resolved to carry on the
struggle for the liberation of the human race to a
victorious issue.

God save America, help the oppressed, and let
freedom reign throughout the earth.

May the day soon come when emancipated Hun-
gary may gratefully return, on the banks of the "free
Danube," the hospitality so fully dispensed to her ex-
iled patriots by the noble Americans.

God bless Hungary! God bless America! A heart-
felt greeting to free America from the exiled patriots
of Hungary.

In the name of the exiled Hungarians, the Com-
mittee—

Col. JOHN PRAGAY, Adjutant General.
SZALAY LASZLO, Colonel.
Major CORNELIUS FORNET.
Major EMERICH RADNICK.

Major GEORGE A. WIMMER, late Minister
Plenipotentiary to the Court of Russia.
Major EDW. THEO. DANBERGH, late Charge
d'Affaires to the United States.
Major EMER HAMRASY.

New York, 26th February, 1850.

MR. CASS GROUND TO POWDER.

[Washington correspondent of the Boston Courier.]
Mr. Cass's confessions in the Senate, the other day,
were exceedingly interesting. He spoke with much
emphasis and a great deal of feeling. He declared
that the South was not, and that the North was not,
but between them he had been ground to powder as
between the upper and nether mill-stone. He said
he had been broken down and overwhelmed, by try-
ing to stand between these counter-currents, and he
aspired to his ruin, when he would die and be
remembered. He considered that the Senate and the country
that knew him so long, would soon know him no
more. He certainly displayed great frankness,
he displayed great weakness also. It is a mistake
that for any man to preach his own funeral sermon.
He preserves many a man alive, who would die and
be remembered before his time comes, if he gave in
example of this. A most distinguished case
any day, if he will look over his right shoulder
to the seat occupied by Harry Clay. There sits a
man who never did say die, and who never will.
A man whose native integrity and extraordinary
elastic friends, and profound admirers without num-
ber, among his most sturdy opponents. But Mr. Cass

qualifies before a storm which the 'Old Harry' would
laugh to scorn, and his face against a flint.

Both Mr. Clay and Mr. Cass, the one in elbowing
his way out of the present maelstrom as fast as he can,
and the other in striving to turn it to his own individ-
ual account, are but performing their several parts
in the great drama, which nature assigned to them.
We may not complain of either for what they are;
but this we may say, that if Mr. Cass were a bolder
man, and Mr. Clay a less aspiring and undying man,
these would be helps to the settlement of the difficul-
ty of the time which do not now exist. But highly
as we estimate the influence of these long discus-
sions, we do not believe that the peace and tran-
quillity of the country is in any degree depend-
ent upon their individual opinions or actions. The
great current of events sweeps on, and in this day
of public opinion, no one man and no ten men can
change or sensibly warp its general set.

'VIOLENT BLACK-HEARTED ABOLITIONIST.'

The following is the petition presented to the U. S.
Senate, which has caused the political phenomenon
of Senator Sumner of Pennsylvania, opening his
mouth, and denouncing it as 'spurious,' 'the work of
some violent, black-hearted abolitionist!'

The association of Friends for promoting the aboli-
tion of slavery, and improving the condition of
the free people of color, respectfully represents:

That the members of the Society of Friends have
long maintained the principle that 'all men are cre-
ated equal, that all should have equal rights and
privileges guaranteed to them as citizens of a common
country.'

In view of this, they have been led to look at the
increased extent of our domain, and of the necessity
of maintaining over its wide surface such equal laws
as shall render happiness and security to all. The
system of slavery, which has so long burdened and
desolated the Southern portion of our land, is viewed
by us all with deep concern, and the four presses upon
us in the admission of new States into the Union,
and the erection of new territories, this terrible
evil may be spread and perpetuated, thus adding
blight to blight, with its vast addition of distress,
of sorrow, and of sin.

We, however, ask you, possessing, as you do, the
legislative power to prevent the increase of this
dreadful evil, by the non-admission of new States
into the Union, or the creation of new territories
whose Constitution or organic laws do not contain
express prohibitions to the establishment or the con-
tinuance of slavery within their limits.

Signed, on behalf of the aforesaid Association, at
their monthly meeting held in Philadelphia, on the
7th day of the 11th month, 1849.

JACOB M. ELLIS, } Clerk.
LYDIA GILLINGHAM, }

DISUNION.

The People's Journal, issued at Connersport, Pa.,
after quoting an article from the Washington Union,
which berates the Liberator for publishing resolu-
tions addressed to the Massachusetts Legislature,
petitions that measure be taken for a peaceable
secession from the Union, holds the following per-
tinent language:

'The slaveholders have always acted on this prin-
ciple, and we hope their organ will keep on denounc-
ing and scolding the people of the North until they
find it out.'

Why shouldn't these lords of the earth claim ex-
clusive right of talking against the Union? They
claim the exclusive right of holding office. They
have dictated to the North for twenty years, and
have been obeyed. They have filled the Executive
Chair—the Speaker's Chair—controlled the Cabinet
—had a majority of the Judges of the Supreme Court,
and three-fourths of the Foreign Ministers. If it is
any privilege to rail against the Union, it would be
in keeping with our usual submission to allow the
slaveholders to have the exclusive enjoyment of
it. So you Boston fanatics will never permit
migrate to Africa or the moon, and not interfere
again in an agitation that belongs exclusively to the
slave power.'

SPEECH
OF THE
HON. JOHN C. CALHOUN,
ON THE SLAVERY QUESTION.

DELIVERED IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
MARCH 4, 1850.

I have, Senators, believed from the first, that the
subject of slavery would, if not pre-empted, be at-
tended by some timely and effective measures, end
in dissolution. Entertaining this opinion, I have, on all
proper occasions, endeavored to call the attention of
both of the two great parties which divide the coun-
try, to adopt some such measure to prevent so great
a disaster, but without success. The agitation has
been pursued to proceed, with almost no attempt
to resist it, until it has reached a period when it
can be no longer disguised or denied that the Union
is in danger. You have thus far forced upon you
the greatest and the gravest question that ever
came under your consideration. How can the Union
be preserved?

It is a satisfactory answer to this mighty ques-
tion, it is indispensable to have an accurate and
thorough knowledge of the nature and the character
of the case by which the Union is endangered.
Without such knowledge, it is impossible to pro-
nounce, with any certainty, by what measure it can
be saved, just as it would be impossible for a physi-
cian to prescribe the case of some dangerous
disease, with any certainty, by what remedy the
disease could be saved, without similar knowledge of
the nature and character of the cause of the dis-
ease. The first question, then, presented for con-
sideration, in the investigation I propose, in order to
obtain such knowledge, is—What is it that has en-
dangered the Union? To this question there can be
but one answer—the immediate cause is, the
almost universal discontent which pervades all the
States composing the Southern section of the Union.
This widely extended discontent is not of recent
origin. It commenced with the agitation of the
slavery question, and has been increasing ever since.
The next question is—What has caused this wide-
spread and almost universal discontent?

It is a great mistake to suppose, as by some, that
it originated with denunciations, who excited the dis-
content with the intention of aiding their personal
advancement, or with disappointed, ambitious indi-
viduals, who resorted to it as the means of raising
their fallen fortunes. There is no foundation for
this notion. On the contrary, all the great political in-
fluences of the section were arrayed against excite-
ment, and exerted to the utmost to keep the people
quiet. The great mass of the people of the South
were divided, as in the other section, into Whigs and
Democrats. The leaders and the presses of both parties
in the South were very solicitous to prevent ex-
citement, and to keep the people quiet; because it was seen
that the effects of the former would necessarily tend to
weaken, if not destroy, the political ties which united
them with their respective parties in the other
section. Those who know the strength of party ties
will readily appreciate the immense force which this
cause exerted against agitation, and in favor of pre-
serving quiet. But as great as it was, it was not suffi-
cient to prevent the wide-spread discontent which
now pervades the section. No; some cause far
deeper and more powerful must exist to produce a

discontent so wide and deep, than the one inferred.
The question then recurs, what is the cause of this
discontent? It will be found in the belief the people
of the Southern States, as prevalent as the discontent
itself, that they must remain, as things now are,
consistently with honor and safety, in the Union.
The next question, then, to be considered, is, what
has caused this belief?

One of the causes is, undoubtedly, to be traced
to the long continued agitation of the slave question on
the part of the North, and the many aggressions which
they have made on the rights of the South, during the
time. I will not enumerate them at present, as it
will be done hereafter in its proper place.

There is another, lying back of it, but with which
this is intimately connected, that may be regarded as
the great and primary cause. It is to be found in the
fact, that the equilibrium between the two sections
of the Union, as it stood, at the same time that
the Constitution was ratified, and the government put in action,
has been destroyed. At that time, there was nearly a
perfect equilibrium between the two, which afforded
ample means to each to protect itself against the
aggression of the other; but as it now stands, one sec-
tion has exclusive power of controlling the govern-
ment, which leaves the other without any adequate
means of protecting itself against its encroachments
and oppression. To place this subject distinctly be-
fore you, I have, Senators, prepared a brief statisti-
cal statement, showing the relative weight of the
two sections in the government, under the first cen-
sus of 1790, and the last census of 1840.

According to the former, the population of the United
States, including Vermont, Kentucky and Tennes-
see, which were then in their incipient condition
of becoming States, but were not actually admitted,
amounting to 3,929,827. Of this number, the Northern
section had 1,977,899, and the Southern 1,951,928,
making a difference of only 25,567 in favor of the
former States. The number of States, including
Vermont, Kentucky and Tennessee, was sixteen, of
which eight, including Kentucky and Tennessee, were
in the Northern section, and eight, including Kentucky
and Tennessee, to the Southern, making an equal division
of the States between the two sections, under the first
census. There was a small preponderance in the
House of Representatives, and in the electoral col-
lege, in favor of the Northern, owing to the fact
that, according to the provisions of the Constitution,
estimating federal numbers, five slaves of the South
were equal to three free whites of the North; but this
was too small to effect sensibly a perfect equilib-
rium of numbers which, with that exception, existed
at that time—a true, perfect equilibrium. Such was
the equality of the two sections when the States
composing them agreed to enter into a federal
Union, and the equilibrium between them has been
greatly destroyed.

According to the last census, the aggregate popu-
lation of the United States amounted to 17,063,357,
of which the Northern section contained 9,728,920, and
the Southern 7,334,437, making a difference, in round
numbers, of 2,400,000. The number of States had
increased from sixteen to twenty-six, making an ad-
dition of ten to the Northern section, and of six to the
Southern. Delaware had become doubtful, as to which sec-
tion she properly belonged. Considering her as neutral,
the Northern States will have thirteen, and the Southern
States twelve, making a difference in the Senate of
two Senators in favor of the former. According to
the apportionment of the census of 1840, there were
223 members of the House of Representatives, of
which the Northern section contained 121, and the
Southern 102, making a difference in the House of
Representatives, of 19; the difference in the Senate
of two members added to this, given to the
North, in the electoral college, a majority of 50.
Since the census of 1840, four States have been ad-
ded to the Union: Iowa, Wisconsin, Florida and Texas.
They leave the difference in the Senate as it stood
when the census was taken, but add two to the side
of the North in the House, making the present ma-
jority in the House in its favor, of 50, and in the
electoral college, of 23.

The result of the whole is, to give to the Northern
section a preponderance in every department of the
government, and thus concentrate in it the two ele-
ments which constitute the federal government—the
majority of States, and majority of their population,
estimated in federal numbers. Whatever section con-
centrates the two in itself, must possess control of
the government.

But we are not at the close of the sixth decade,
and the commencement of the seventh. The census is to
be taken this year, which must add greatly to the
decided preponderance of the North in the House of
Representatives and in the electoral college. The
prospect also is, that a great increase will be added
to its present preponderance during the period of the
decade, by the admission of new States, and the great
territories—Oregon and Minnesota—are already in pro-
gress, and strenuous efforts are making to bring in
three additional States from the territory recently
conquered from Mexico, which, if successful, will
add three other States in a short time to the Northern
section, making five States, and increasing its
present number of States from twenty to twenty-five,
and its Senators from thirty to thirty-five.

On the contrary, there is not a single territory in
progress in the Southern section, and no certainty
that any additional State will be added to it during
the decade. The prospect then is, that the two sec-
tions in the Senate, should the efforts now made to
exclude the South from the newly conquered territory
be successful, will be reduced to twelve Southern,
and twenty Northern States to twelve Southern, (con-
ceding Delaware as neutral,) and forty Northern
Senators to twenty-four Southern. This great in-
crease of Senators, added to the great increase of
members of the House of Representatives, and electo-
ral college, on the part of the North, which must
take place upon the next decade, will effectually as-
surely stand, before the end of the next decade,
the government concentrated.

Had this destruction been the operation of time,
without the interference of government, the South
would have had no reason to complain; but such was
not the fact. It was caused by the legislation of this
government, and the whole power of the system
centered in all, and charged with the protection of the
interests and security of all. The legislation by
which it has been effected may be classed under three
heads. The first is that series of acts by which the
South has been excluded from the common territory
belonging to all the States, as the members of the
federal Union, and the effect of this legislation is, to
exclude the South from the newly conquered territory,
and to restrict the portion allotted to the Southern section,
and restricting within narrow limits the portion left
to the South. The next consists in adopting a sys-
tem of revenue and disbursements by which the un-
due proportion of the burden of taxation has been
imposed upon the South, and an undue proportion of
its proceeds appropriated to the North; and the last
in a system of political measures by which the origi-
nal character of the government has been radically
changed.

I propose to bestow on each of these, in the order
they stand, a few remarks, with the view of showing
that it is owing to the action of this government, that
the equilibrium between the two sections has been
destroyed, and the whole power of the system cen-
tered in a sectional majority.

The first organized movement towards it commenced
in 1835. Then, for the first time, societies were
organized, presses established, lectures sent forth to
excite the people of the North, and incendiary pub-
lications scattered over the whole South through the
mail. The South was thoroughly aroused, meetings
were held everywhere, and resolutions adopted, call-
ing upon the North to apply a remedy to arrest the
threatened evil, and pledging themselves to ad-
vance for their own protection if it was not ar-

rested. At the meeting of Congress, petitions were
presented in from the North, calling upon Congress to
abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and to
prohibit what they called the internal slave trade be-
tween the States, avowing at the same time that
their ultimate object was to abolish slavery not only
in the District, but in the States and throughout the
Union. At this period, the number engaged in the
agitation was small, and it possessed little or no
personal influence.

Neither party in Congress had, at that time, any
sympathy with them or their cause; the members of
each party presented their petitions with great re-
luctance. Nevertheless, as small and as contemptible
as the party then was, both of the great parties of
the North dreaded them. They felt that though
small, they were organized with reference to a sub-
ject which had a great and commanding influence
in the Northern mind. Each party, on this point,
counted, feared to oppose their petitions, lest the op-
posite party should take advantage of the one who
opposed, by favoring them. The effect was, that
both united in insisting that the petitions should be
received, and Congress took jurisdiction of the sub-
ject for which they prayed; and to justify their
action, they extended over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that Congress
would, by extending over the whole Union, and
was bound to receive petitions on every subject, how-
ever objectionable it might be, and whether they had
or had not jurisdiction over the subject. These views
prevailed in the House of Representatives, and par-
ticularly in the Senate, and thus the party suc-
ceeded, in their first movement, in gaining what they
proposed—a position in Congress, from which the agi-
tation could be extended over the whole Union.

This was the commencement of the agitation,
which has ever since continued, and which, as it
is now acknowledged, has endangered the Union
itself.

As to myself, I believe, at that early period, that
if the party who got up the petitions should succeed
in getting Congress to take jurisdiction, that

A FULL REPORT, REVISED BY HIMSELF.

And it is this circumstance, sir, the prohibition of slavery by that Convention, which has contributed to raise—to do not say it has wholly raised—the dispute as to the propriety of the admission of California into the Union under this Constitution. Mr. Fremont has denied, Mr. President, that anything of this kind, that whatever reasons were assigned at the commencement of the late war with Mexico, it was prosecuted for the purpose of the acquisition of territory. Under this and the argument that the cessation of territory was the only proper condition of acquisition could be made to the United States by Mexico for the various claims and demands which the people of this country had against that government. At any rate, it will be found that Pres. Polk's message at the commencement of the session of 1847, in which he announced to Congress that the acquisition of territory was made. And that the acquisition was to be south of the line of the United States in warm climates and countries, it was not, as I suppose, expected by the South, that what

what is pert, and that there are no compromises or modifications to be made in submission to difference of opinion, or in deference to other men's judgment. If their perspicacious vision enables them to detect spots on the face of the sun, they think that a good reason why they should not look at the sun in heaven. They prefer the chance of running into utter darkness to living in heavenly light, if that heavenly light be not absolutely without any imperfection. They are impatient men, too impatient always to give heed to the commission of St. Paul, that "we should not to evil that good may come;—no;—but rather let us wait for the slow progress of moral causes in the improvement of mankind. They do not remember that the doctrines and miracles of Jesus Christ have, in eighteen hundred years, converted only a small portion of the human race; and among the nations that are converted to Christianity, they forget how many vices are still rampant, how immorality still prevail, and that many of them, public crimes especially, which are offences against the

Mr. Webster.—I am very happy to hear that he is—may he long be in health and the enjoyment of it—to serve his country—said the other day that he considered this ordinance as the first in the series of measures which would be necessary to deprive them of their just participation in the benefits and privileges of this government. He says very properly that it was done under the old confederation, and before this constitution went into effect; but, that it was done with the entire and unanimous concurrence of the whole South. Why, there it stands! The vote of every State in the Union was unanimous in favor of it. It was the act of the whole people individual vote, and that individual was a Northern man. But, sir, the ordinance abolishing or rather prohibiting slavery Northwest of the Ohio, has the hand and seal of every Southern member in Congress. The vote of every Southern member in the Convention meant to leave slavery, in the States, as they found it, entirely under the authority and control of the States. That was the state of opinion under which those two very important matters

Allow me to read the resolution. It is the third clause of the second section of the resolution of the 1st of March, 1845, for the admission of Texas, which applies to this part of the case. That clause reads in these words:—

‘New States, of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, and having sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission under the provisions of the Federal Constitution. And such States as may be formed out of the portion of said territory lying south of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes north latitude, commonly known as the Mi-

Mr. Webster.—That was the object set forth in the correspondence of a worthy gentleman not now living, who preceded the honorable member from South Carolina in that office. There repose on the files of the Department of State, as I have occasion to know, strong letters from Mr. Upshur to the United States minister in England, and I believe there are some others, in which the honorable member's predecessor, Mr. Upshur, expressed to the Senator himself, asserting to this effect, that the policy of this Government, that Great Britain was expected not to interfere to take Texas out of the hands of its then existing Government, and make it a free country. But my argument, my suggestion is this; that those gentlemen who composed the Northern majority in the Senate, who were brought into the Union, with all their eyes, that it was a free, a free slave country, and brought in for the purpose of being maintained as slave territory to the Greek Kalends. I rather think the honorable gentleman who was then Secretary of State might, in some of his correspondence with Mr. Murphy, have suggested that it was not his duty to say much about this object, that it might create some alarm. At any rate, Mr. Murphy wrote to him, that England was anxious to get rid of the Constitution of Texas, because it was a Constitution establishing slavery; and that the United States had to do was to aid England in this, by avoiding this question of Texas. But, nothing else did I say, which could offend

Mr. Greene here read the following extract:

"We hear much just now of a *panacea* for the dangers and evils of slavery and slave annexation, which they call '*Wolcott's Provision*.' That certainly will succeed, if it be the *Wolcott's Provision* of any new party upon it. It is not a sentiment on which Massachusetts Whigs differ. There is not a man in this hall who holds to it more firmly than I do, and no one who adheres to it more than another."

"But," said Mr. Greene, "the matter, sir, did I not commit myself in 1838 to the whole doctrine, fully, entirely? And I must be permitted to say, that I should not quite consent that more recent discoverers should be permitted to appropriate my sentiments."

"I deny the priority of their invention. Allow me to say, sir, it is not their thunder." *

"We are to use the first, and last, and every one of the slave."

[illegible]



THE COMPROMISERS.

To the Committee of the Millville Anti-Slavery FAIR, held at Millville on the 21st and 22d of February, the following lines were respectfully dedicated by their author.

O, injured Africa! thy suppliant hands
And tearful eyes are raised in prayer to Heaven;
Thy wall of sadness reaches to all lands;
No wrongs compare with thine—ah, it is given
To thee, poor Africa, to suffer! Riven
For centuries have been the bonds between
Thy children and their brethren. Long have striven
Thy friends from slavery and wrong to screen
Thy sons and daughters, and to liberty redeem.

And yet 'tis not enough! they clamor still
For Africa's blood. 'More room, more room,' they cry,
'In which our destiny we may fulfill!'
And Africans by millions still die,
Beneath the blighting curse. Fearful is the cry
Of human blood from swamps of rice that rise,
Or cotton fields, where tender mothers sigh
For their loved infants, reaching to the skies,
And pleading with our God in judgment to arise.

When fair Missouri's fruitful valleys asked
For Africa's blood, the friends of liberty
Would fain have dwelt alone therein. Not tasked
And cringing slave upon its soil they'd see,
But all erect, and lithe, and good and free.
O then the monster howled! the subdivider
His game began—the Union threatened—
He called to his aid each man and God-despiser;
But first in rank there came the mighty Compromiser.

With sugared words he soothed the freeman's fears,
To slaveholders he gave a knowing wink—
I will not stir—he might have shed some tears!
The sacred (?) Union (!) was his theme, I think.
Freemen became alarmed lest the strong link
(Strong certainly it must have been, so long
To bind the living to the dead) should sink
In estimation of the voting throng;
And so another compromise was made with wrong.

The Union was preserved! the bargain made!
O Africa, what a cruel fate for thee!
Quick'ning at once the foul soul-driver's trade
In every branch—on river, gulf and sea—
Putting far off the day of jubilee.

The blood and tears of thy poor sons and daughters
Have moistened all those fertile plains—ah me!
They're mingled with the rushing waters,
As Southward they've been borne, like cattle to the slaughters.

And is not this enough? Ah no! for more
The horse-leech daughter cries, 'More land! make room!

I want a place to be,' she says; 'the shore
Of fair Pacific is my bound. I'll soon
My shambles open there, and give a boon
To my fair friends. For theirs the goodly land
Shall henceforth be, while sun or moon
Endure. Just by this glorious Union stand!
And Southern States and men will gain what they demand.'

'Back, foul demon, to thy place in hell!'
Shout many millions of the free-lance crew;
'The evils thou hast wrought no tongue can tell—
Thou art an abomination, a foul disgrace;
Thy bounds are set. No farther shalt thou go;
Thy bloody marks on all our land we trace.
Fair Liberty the shores of oceans shall embrace,
And industry and peace on all bestow,
Making again a paradise for men below.

The Compromiser's slaves grew 'fat and sleek,'
And happy too, he said, they're apt to stray;
And he became religious quite, and meek;
He was immersed, and went, 'tis thought, to pray;
And walked in most things in a godly way.
'Twas all in vain! the nomination bore
Another god, which vexed him much, they say,
And left him quite disconsolate at home;
Where much we hoped he'd stay, and fast and pray
alone!

But when he saw the danger of the Union—
Or, rather, Slavery's want of elbow room—
He left his quiet home and sweet communion
With holy books and prayer (?) and soon, too soon
For Freedom's cause he'll leave the Senate-room;
Blinding again the trusting people's eyes,
Filling poor Africa's friends with fear and gloom,
Taking all parties by a grand surprise,
And make for slavery another compromise.
The furnishes of stock for Southern trade
Will now, no doubt, be looking up their breeders;
In coming times great fortunes will be made,
In spite, I fear, of all come-out-seekers
From white or State, or mighty party leaders.
'Tis said white cattle fetch far more than others,
(I now crave pardon of all chaste readers;
The thing's in fault, not I)—O brother!
Is't this that makes the child seem lighter than its mother?

And is it thus your coffers fill with gold?
The child, by law, the mother's fortune takes;
Where are these pale-faced children, bought and sold?
Just heavens! are men transformed to crawling snakes,
Devoing their own offspring? Why, this makes
One's blood quite curdle in his swelling veins!
The sum of villanies it surely takes,
Upon God's image to imprint such stains;
And yet they will be there while slavery remains.

Ye mighty Doctors of Divinity,
Who labor hard to Christianize such sin;
You have a quite consistent trinity
In slavery, war, and endless hell! Begin,
Good sirs, to plume your quills for flight; you've been
Doing a heavy business, we'll allow.
In pious frauds, to still the growing din
Of anti-slavery. Another job is now
Upon your hands: of course you'll do it—you know
how.

Ye mighty Doctors of a softer creed,
Indefinite, Ultras, Restorations!
Who hold the Fatherhood of God, indeed!
And brotherhood of man of all the nations,
And yet with hired cut-throats take your stations,
And labor hard to bolster slavery,
Here's work for you—full pay and rations.
For some persist in holding it rank knavery—
This whole concern—in spite of prayers and bravery.

Here's labor plenty for all hands, I think,
To justify this business of extension
In all its many parts. Each subtle link
Of argument must be well made; attention
Must be given to logic! and much mention
Duly made of holy scripture (?)—indeed
You must now tax to its utmost your invention;
Or much I fear that you will not succeed
In making this extension act a very righteous deed!

What can by man be done, you'll do, no doubt!
You are the bulwark of gigantic wrong;
Old crimes by your supernal (?) touch come out
Organic sins, and may be practised long;
And freely too, by every praying throng,
Without a forfeiture of Christian name.
O God of truth and love! how long, how long
Shall such base away? O let the living flame
Of thy pure truth purge off right quick this damning
shame!

Ye hardy millions of the North and West,
Whose hands are hard with freedom's manly toil—
Now crush, for you've the power, the base depolier
Of human rights. It has its snaky coil
About your hearts and limbs. No foot of soil
Throughout this land is free; 'tis tainted all
As slavery's hunting ground; the sad recoil
Of violated right on you doth fall;
You can't be wholly free, and leave them in their
thrall.

Up, Democrat, and Whig, and firm Free Soiler!
Whose hands are hard with freedom's manly toil—
Now crush, for you've the power, the base depolier
Of human rights. It has its snaky coil
About your hearts and limbs. No foot of soil
Throughout this land is free; 'tis tainted all
As slavery's hunting ground; the sad recoil
Of violated right on you doth fall;
You can't be wholly free, and leave them in their
thrall.

Ye faithful few, who've burst the selfish band
Which holds the nation in its foul embrace,
O cease not to proclaim throughout the land,
What God demands—freedom for all the race.
The Church and Union are a deep disgrace
On Christ and manhood, while they hold this sin—
While on their robes the blood of slaves we trace,
'Tis treason to our God if we come in
To share the league with them—our peace or true
begin.

Not all the eloquence that men possess,
Not painters, sculptors, and the poets too,
Conspiring 'Hurry of the West' to bless,
Can give him to the future great and true.
These dark deeds done, they never can undo.
Should even they do this work essay,
Millions of handcuffed slaves will rise to view,
Cursing, as well they might, the sunless day
That sent on Africa's race the Compromiser Clay!

Reformatory.

WOMAN'S RIGHTS AND DUTIES.

OBSERVATIONS ON MR. GREW'S REMARKS CONTINUED.

MR. GARRISON:

Mr. Grew continues to labor with indefatigable zeal to overturn our position of the equality of the sexes. In the preceding article, he endeavors to show that woman is a subordinate to man by nature, her king and lawgiver in temporality. In the article at present under review, he manifests equal zeal to prove that woman occupies a degraded, inferior position in spiritual matters. He represents her as barely permitted to enter the house of God, to sit at the foot of her master, or rather sit at the foot of her master in the family, to be taught. 'For it is recorded as a permanent rule and as a commandment of the Lord, if women will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home.' Woman occupies the novice's seat, from the principle that she belongs to an inferior, subordinate caste, as to physical organization, and as a tribute of adoration to man's sovereignty. Not from a principle of moral and intellectual inferiority to man. This is a dominion 'like the prince of the Gentiles,' Matt. 20: 25. It is not the principle of Christianity. When the foundation is *anti-Christian*, what must the superstructure be?

Passing over Mr. Grew's preliminary observations, we will proceed to consider his remarks which have a more immediate bearing on the question at issue. He limits the meaning of the portion of Scripture, 'There is neither male nor female in Christ Jesus,' Gal. 3: 28, to all being alike partakers of grace. Is that any new revelation or new gospel principle? or was grace limited to the Jews, to the exclusion of the Gentiles? We answer, no; God is no respecter of persons. But there was a great difference between Jew and Gentile respecting privileges. It is the privilege of believers that the apostle is speaking of, as is made manifest in the succeeding chapter.

Mr. Grew says, 'The prophecy of Joel, that the Divine Spirit should be poured out on the sons and daughters, referred to the Christian era, and was fulfilled. Anna, Elizabeth and Mary prophesied under the new, as well as Deborah, Miriam and Huldah under the former dispensation.' He is right, 'that the prophecy of Joel referred to the Christian era,' but he is sadly mistaken when he says, 'Anna, Elizabeth and Mary prophesied under the New.' The New did not commence until after Christ's crucifixion. Christ lived under the Mosaic dispensation, and observed the Mosaic ritual; and Anna was the last established prophet under the Old dispensation. Peter says expressly, Acts 2: 17, 'That the Spirit was poured out on the day of Pentecost, as was spoken by the prophet Joel,' and quotes the words of the text. See Woman's Rights, p. 170. Mr. Grew draws an argument for the permanency of the apostle's supposed prohibition of women speaking in the Church, from the fact that it is embodied in 1st Corinthians, 14, where the rules for the permanent order of the Church are contained. Now, if this were true, it would be worthy of consideration; but the *reverse is the fact*, for it is contained in the chapter where he was regulating supernatural gifts, which were temporary effusions, and were common to both sexes; hence the apostle would not forbid their exercise in either sex. Mr. Grew says, 'It is not true that the apostle in this chapter—1st Cor. 14—was directing the exercise of supernatural gifts, and no other; he directs us not only concerning prayer and singing, but also in respect to the common gift of speaking to edification and exhortation and comfort.' Well, we have an open Bible, let the reader judge for himself. What direction does he give about prayer or singing? He (the apostle) directs them to sing or pray with the spirit, and with the understanding also; with reference to those who prayed or sang in an unknown tongue. Was this not a supernatural gift? Certainly he directed them to speak to edification, in the exercise of their supernatural gifts. He was directing supernatural gifts, and no other, and continued to do so from the beginning to the end of the chapter, with the exception of the 34th and 35th verses. There are some general principles laid down that would be of use to ordinary congregations; but it would not be a violation of any of them for women to speak in the Church, in a decent and orderly manner. It is perfectly futile to argue the point. It is plain that the design of the apostle in this chapter is to regulate supernatural gifts, and no other. No ordinary religious assembly is conducted in the manner he directs. For example, verse 31: 'For you may all prophesy one by one, that all may learn and all be comforted,—all who have the gift of prophecy. Verse 34: 'Let your women keep silence in the Churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience, as also saith the Lord. They are commanded to be in the original. Verse 35: 'And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home; for it is a shame for women to speak in the Church.' We know Philip had four daughters, unmarried, who did prophesy—Acts 21: 9. How would it answer to tell them to keep silence in the Churches? And if they will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home.' This latter injunction is as imperative as the former, and equally the 'commandment of the Lord.' One convincing proof why this prohibition was not intended to be universal and general, is that it embraces but one class of females, married women. It is plain, those women were doing nothing like preaching; the object of preaching is to give information, not to learn. It is plain, those women were interrogating their husbands in public, according to the disputatious spirit of the age. They were not capable of conducting a discussion, nor was the Church a proper place; it produced 'confusion,'

and the apostle directed them, if they would learn any thing, to ask those questions at home; for it is a shame for wives or matrons to talk thus in the congregation. Mr. Grew says, 'It is not true that the apostle said it was a shame for women to talk thus in the congregation. He said, 'It was a shame for women to speak in the Church, without any qualification or reference to the manner of their speaking.' Well, doctors will differ. The editor of the Comprehensive Commentary says, 'The word here translated speak, almost universally in the New Testament signifies not to speak, but to talk; and the Greek here for women properly signifies wives, matrons, and we are sure it ought to be wives, because the correlative husband is spoken of in connection.' Now, this shows it was but one class of females that behaved thus disorderly, and were not under any supernatural impulse of the Spirit; for the supernatural gifts of the Spirit were given for the edification of the Church, for the work of the ministry. And we know those gifts were common to both men and women. Forasmuch, then, as God gave women like gifts as he did unto men, could or would Paul withstand God? Paul in this chapter was directing the exercises of those who were supernaturally gifted, and no other; and in this connection, he directs women who were thus gifted to keep silence in the Church. Anna spoke in the Temple, or preached in the Temple, declaring Christ's advent in the flesh; Luke 2: 37, 38; and we know men and women spoke indiscriminately on the day of Pentecost; 'on the sons and on the daughters was the spirit poured out, and they shall prophesy, saith God; and on the servants and on the handmaidens will I pour out on those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy, saith God.' Mr. G. represents Paul as opposing God, and saying women shall not prophesy, and those who had previously spoken in the Church had acted shamefully. He said, 'It is a shame for women to speak in the Church, without any qualification or reference to the manner of their speaking'—or rather, that the Spirit of God acted shamefully to impel women to speak. And Mr. G. represents the honored apostle as ineffectually inconsistent with himself, telling the women it was a shame to do what he himself had, an hour previously, approbated and adjusted, in the 11th chapter of the same epistle! The way Mr. G. shows off the apostle, we would suppose that Paul would exclaim, 'O inconsistency, thou art a jewel!' If ever there was one man above all others who had reason to say, 'Save me from my professed friends, Paul is that man.' Slaveholding professed Christian ministers and people also claim Paul as their special friend, benefactor and patron saint; and the political despot claims the same relationship to Paul. Mr. G. makes very light of the word of the Lord spoken by Paul in 1st Cor. 11. It is strange that his veneration makes such quick transitions. He says, 'The reference to women prophesying with the head covered in the 11th chapter—what does the reference prove? Certainly nothing more than that some women did, 'in some manner,' pray and prophesy. It is a violation of just rules of interpretation, to allow this incidental reference to women prophesying in some manner to subvert the subsequent plain prohibition of the inspired writer.' Did you not say, Mr. Grew, the apostle said, 'It is a shame for women to speak in the Church, without any reference to the manner of their speaking?' They were to keep silence. Now you say, they prophesied 'in some manner.' It was the Spirit of God that 'in some manner' prophesied; women were but the instruments, the Spirit of the Lord spoke by them, and His word was on their tongue. It is the Spirit of God you estimate so low, not the women. Whatever it was for men to pray and prophesy in the congregations, it was the same in women. Did not the prophetesses under the Old Testament prophesy in the same manner? as did the prophets? And did they not speak with as much publicity? Huldah prophesied in the king's chapel and to the king's court, and Anna in the Temple. They did not 'peep and mutter in a corner,' more than did the prophets; and their sayings make equally good texts as do men's; and women's sayings do men's. For example, the sayings of the woman of Samaria would make as good texts as would a man's, and though dead, will still speak in the Church till time shall be no more. What are we to think of a theory which takes such daubing with untempered mortar to support it—even undervaluing the Spirit of God? Women prophesying in 'some manner,' indeed! They must utter some refuse prophecy, some jargon; their bodily presence was weak, and their speech must be contemptible. 'Do my prophets no harm,' is the command of God. 'He that despiseth you despiseth me.' The fact that women were supernaturally gifted, and that those gifts were given for the edification of the Church for the work of the ministry, are sufficient proof of themselves to answer all cavils against women speaking in the Church, and proves conclusively that the apostle did not prohibit the exercise of those gifts in the Church. And all existing facts, precepts and examples agree with this opinion, with the exception of two isolated passages, 'incidental references,' and all the ingenuity of man cannot reconcile these contradictions on the hypothesis that women were prohibited from exercising their gifts in public assemblies. Woman's Rights, pp. 149-166.

Mr. Grew has made an effort to reconcile them; but it is evident he did not succeed in his satisfaction. He has adopted an expedient which proves his theory conclusively, namely, Paul knew that all the individuals we have enumerated were supernaturally gifted, and that those gifts were given for the edification of the Church; and he knew those individuals did exercise them in the Church in some manner. (1) and he knew it was the Spirit of God speaking by them; yet none of these things deterred him from recording, as a permanent rule, and as the commandment of the Lord, that women should keep silence in the Churches, for it is not permitted unto them to speak.' This is begging the question. Mr. G. says, 'How unreasonable it would be to require all women to be in silence, because the women of one Church spoke disorderly!' There was no fear of the Corinthians misunderstanding the apostle, by supposing that he intended to prohibit all women from speaking in the Church, for he had regulated and adjusted the manner of women speaking in the Church in the 11th chapter of the same epistle. This he plainly announced in the very chapter where we find more particular directions concerning the permanent order of the Christian Church than in any other in the New Testament. In this chapter, he is regulating the standing ordinances of the Church, preaching and praying; warns them against divisions and heresies, and gives a detailed account of the ordinance of the supper. 'It is no incidental reference' to women speaking in the Church. It is one of the special points of discussion in this chapter, and it is correct that the apostle wrote fourteen verses of ordinary length in this chapter to regulate the manner of women speaking in the Church. It is deemed wholly unnecessary to argue this point; let the Bible speak for itself. The apostle adjusts the manner of men and women speaking in the congregation, beginning with the third verse, and ending with the sixteenth, inclusive; we might have included the second verse as connected with the same subject. He says, 'I praise you, brethren, that you keep the ordinances as I delivered them unto you.' What ordinances did he praise them for keeping? Why, the ordinances of praying and preaching, performed by men and women. He gives reasons from nature (which is always the same) why he thought it most becoming that the man should officiate with his head uncovered, and the woman with her's covered. He did not give this opinion as authoritative, but referred it to their own

judgment for decision, v. 13th. In the 11th and 12th verses, he applies his subject, and they contain the pith of his discourse, as the application is the life of preaching. Verse 11: 'Nevertheless, neither is the man without the woman, neither is the Church without the man in the Lord.' Verse 12: 'For (or because) as the man is the head of the Church, as his body is the woman, how worthy of the consideration of those who make light of apostolic precepts is this forcible reason given by the apostle why man and woman are to be co-laborers in the gospel! For, says Paul, 'I have received of the Lord that which I delivered unto you.' As long as woman continues to be the mother of mankind, man and woman are to be fellow-laborers in the Church of Christ. We most emphatically ask, as the apostle here, by the authority of God, represents woman in the character of mother, when he is thus regulating public ordinances, where is her honor in a Church capacity? Does it become her children to place her at their footstool as a degraded novice? The lack of filial respect has become a national characteristic with the people of these United States. Disrespect to one parent leads to disrespect to both. How could a son respect a mother who is held out by those who ought to be the conservators of the morals of community as a degraded vassal, both temporally and spiritually? Mr. G. says, 'If because woman was made for man and not man for woman, or because she was first in the transgression, or for no revealed reason at all, the Creator has in some respects assigned her a different station from man, it is her highest honor and happiness to conform to the Divine will.'

It is not because 'woman was made for man' that she is to keep silence in the Church. The apostle gives that as a reason why she should have her head covered when she spoke in the Church, but not as a reason why she should keep silence; nor is it because she was first in the transgression, because we know many women have spoken in the Church. And we are told the reason is revealed why she is thus restricted—it is to manifest her degraded position, and to exalt the man to a 'secondary God.' It is not for the purpose of promoting her honor or happiness. We have again and again solicited an explanation of the 11th and 12th verses, standing in their connections, but we never have succeeded in extorting one. 'It is obviously futile to consider' this regulation local or temporary in its nature, as he gives reasons from nature for the regulation why man and woman should exercise their gifts in the Church, and it was co-extensive—16th verse—with all 'the Churches of God.' The directions given in this chapter and 1 Tim. 2: 9, 10, are much the same. After the apostle had directed worshippers as to the duty of prayer, he goes on to adjust the apparel of women who officiated in the congregation. They were to appear in modest apparel, with shamefacedness, (or with their heads covered,) which becometh women preaching godliness. The first literal translation of the word is preaching, which in the 10th verse is translated professing. Some women in this Church had behaved in a similar manner with some at Corinth. He then goes on to show how the conduct of these women was aggravated by the position they occupied in the human family. No member of the human family is permitted to usurp authority. From the fact that women are forbidden to commit an impropriety, it is thought the committing of that act would be no impropriety in men. For example: the woman is told to learn in silence; this gives man a license to talk incessantly all the time he is under instruction; or because the tenth commandment forbids a man to covet his neighbor's wife, a woman is privileged to covet her neighbor's husband. Woman's Rights, pp. 158, 159.

Mr. G. says, 'There is no evidence that the women in the Corinthian Church were any more disorderly than the men. It is equally necessary that he should have given the same command to the men to keep silence.' True, men were fully as disorderly as the women, but each sex seemed to have a disorder peculiar to themselves, and there was but one class of females embraced in the reproof, namely, married women. He reproofs men for drunkenness and gluttony when partaking of the ordinance of the supper. He tells them to eat and drink at home, 1st Cor. 11: 21, 22. (Wonder if he allowed women to act the glutton and the drunkard, because he did not forbid them.) 'Aquila and Priscilla taught Apollos, but they took him unto them (i. e., privately) and taught him.' Did not Priscilla still remain the immutable woman in private as well as in public? and she must not teach a man. This principle would prevent a mother from teaching her son. It is evident the apostle did not intend to forbid women to teach in a proper manner, as many women had taught publicly. We know Deborah taught the law to Israel forty years, but they were not to usurp authority and become dictators. If it is a command that all women are to keep silence in the Church—1st Cor. 14: 34, 35—it is certainly equally imperative if women will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home. Why is not this latter injunction particularly enforced as an important duty, and as a commandment of the Lord, that if women will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home, and see to it that the injunction is strictly performed? Mr. G. believes that this is a commandment of the Lord; in this he is consistent. He deeply sympathizes with a preacher whom he supposes we have treated discourteously in our book for declaring his belief of the important truth that women were to be learned by their husbands at home. We charged him with exhibiting this doctrine to the public just in order to degrade women, as we were convinced he had no idea of its being carried out practically. Woman's Rights, p. 231. Mr. G. identifies himself with this maligned preacher, and pitifully exclaims, 'Are the above charges justly preferred against us because we believe the word of the Lord?'

Now, any person looking at the state of society, would see it would not do for a general rule for women, if they would learn any thing, to ask their husbands at home; nor would it have answered in Paul's day—he speaks of unbelieving husbands, &c. Some women have no husbands. Mr. G. can soon dispatch these objections. He will say that Paul knew there were unbelieving husbands, in his day, who might be saved by the means of the believing wife; hence the wife was the teacher. And bacchanalian husbands, who neither knew nor cared about religion; and he knew there were imbecile husbands, who had views of good understanding, as a Nabal and an Abigail; and he knew that religious information was more extensively diffused among women, with the exception of ministers of the gospel; a great majority of men, Gallio like, neither knew nor cared for any of these things; and he also knew there were some women who had no husbands, and he knew there would be to this day a great many of all the above characters, for he spoke by the Spirit of God, who saw the end from the beginning; yet none of these things deterred him from 'recording,' as a permanent rule, and as the word of the Lord, if women will learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home.

We have observed that Paul called some women fellow-laborers, helpers in Christ Jesus. Woman's Rights, p. 149. Mr. G. says, 'When it can be proved that there can be no laboring in the service of Jesus Christ, no helping of his servants, besides preaching and teaching in public congregations, we shall be obliged to allow that there is, at least, an apparent discrepancy in the writings of the apostle.' The discrepancy is in *yourself*, not in the writings of the apostle; it is your wrong construction which makes the discrepancy. The apostle also says, 'those women which labored with me in the gospel.' The gospel signifies good news or glad tidings. Now, laboring with the apostle in the gospel signifies that they labored with the apostle in promulgating good news or glad tidings of grace and salvation to mankind sinners; and not to baking cakes, entertaining the ministers, serving tables, &c. Mr. G. says, 'It is to be regretted that the author has made some unwarrantable inferences from the writings of her Christian brethren, which place them in a false position, and manifests a zeal in attempting to establish her theory, which is not always in accordance with either knowledge or truth.' As to our knowledge we do not boast, but as to our want of truth, we are confident it is heavy charge, and we demand specifications. We have made no assertions without giving the proof. We anticipated charges of untruthfulness which compelled us to bring some individuals unfavorably before the public, for whom we had a personal respect. Had we noticed the puerile cavils which are presented to support this aristocracy of sex, which has so long cursed the world, without pointing out the sources from whence they emanated, we undoubtedly would have been taxed with lying. We are the aggrieved party, and have chosen the language which in our opinion was best calculated to express our grievances. It is principles, and not men, we are combating. Had we been writing a treatise on the side of our opponents, we could not have treated their side of the question with more truthfulness, nor did we draw an inference from their premises that was not in our opinion legitimate. We are taxed with drawing an unwarrantable inference from Mr. Grew's remarks on 1st Tim. 2: 13, 1st Cor. 11: 8, 9—Woman's Rights, p. 20. Mr. Henry says, 'All which are urged as reasons for the humility, modesty, silence and submissiveness of that sex in general.' Our inference, that is, we suppose it must teach the mother humility and modesty, silence and submissiveness to the son, as she is of that sex; and that this is not an 'unwarrantable inference' is made clear by the following. In commenting on Gen. 3: 16, he says, 'The whole sex, by creation equal with man, is for sin put under subjection, and made inferior.' Now, when the whole sex is made inferior and put under subjection, it is not a legitimate inference that the mother is put under subjection to the son? Woman's Rights, p. 23.

As to the remarks we have made on Barnes on Slavery, Woman's Rights, pp. 224-229, we retract nothing we have said; we never saw so low an estimate of woman as he exhibits. The wife is the slave and the husband the master, to all intents and purposes, except he thinks 'it would be an abuse of gain, and is not fairly implied in the relation.' He passes by the mother as a nonentity in parental duties. He speaks as if the whole duty of training children devolves on fathers. They are enemies to the human family, let them design it or not, that would lower the mother's responsibility, or detract from her honor, or weaken her influence. Barnes on Slavery is before the public, and will speak for itself. We have no personal acquaintance with Mr. Barnes, but from what we know of him by character, we respect him, and it gives us pain to be laid under the necessity to say, we deprecate his principles respecting the standing of one-half of the human family.

At the beginning of Mr. Grew's former article, he acknowledges 'that man has oppressed woman, and has exercised dominion over her that God never gave him;' and he concludes the present article by the same acknowledgment. He says, 'Most shamefully man has abused his power by his disobedience to the command to love his wife as himself.' (When did usurers not abuse their power?) 'Obedience to this precept will ever duly regulate, for mutual felicity, the authority which God has given him in the most endearing human relationship.'

We have already trespassed on the columns of the Liberator, and will pursue this subject no further, at present, but refer to our book, which has elicited this discussion, where the questions we have had under review are treated at length.

We conclude by asking Mr. Grew how much authority has God given man in the most endearing human relationship? This is an important inquiry. How much authority would the husband wish the wife to exercise over him, or would the exercise of her authority operate for his felicity, supposing their relationship were reversed? A due consideration of these inquiries will enable the husband to judge with precision how much authority he is to exercise over the wife, in fulfillment of the commandment 'to love her as himself.'

ELIZABETH WILSON.
Cádiz, Ohio, Feb. 22, 1850.

FROM THE KENNEBEC JOURNAL.

CUSTOMS OF THE PURITANS.

LYCUM. The lecture last week by EDWARD QUINCY of Massachusetts was a very amusing and instructive account of the manners and customs of our Puritan ancestors, their early laws for the regulation of dress and divers domestic matters, extending even to the proper regulation of the love passages between young men and maidens. The risible muscles of the audience were pretty frequently exercised, while at times their stern countenances were touched; and we believe all were highly interested by the wit and eloquence of the speaker, and instructed by his piquant descriptions. We think Boston of the present day would hardly be recognized in his picture of Boston of the seventeenth century, when turps and cabbage were grown in Washington street, and cows were pastured at the South End. The city exquisites, who emerged on Sunday to sport their goatees on the trottoirs and promenades, would scarcely relish the strict discipline of Puritan times, when the commander of a British man-of-war and his boat's crew were set in the stocks because they refused to go to meeting when they came ashore one Sabbath morning; and when all the shops were regularly closed, and business suspended on the Thursday lecture. We think attendance on religious services is not quite so punctual in Boston now as in those days—better for many a city youth and maiden if it were. The circumstance above alluded to of the British captain being put in the stocks, was quoted from a writer of the period, who, although not vouching for its strict truth, told a good deal of the sequel to it. It seemed that the captain had put the captain in limbo on the wharf, bawling out to release him, apologizing for the matter by alluding to the strictness of their religious regulations. The officer told them to take no excuse; he was himself an advocate of strict discipline, and he blamed nobody for enforcing the law; and as a proof of his good feeling, he invited them all to dine with him next day on board ship. They accordingly went, and were regaled with all the good things of the time, and plied with first rate liquors, (testimonials were not then extant, and even churchwardens loved good liquor,) until they became as mellow as to walk particularly crooked when they rose from table to go home. It was now the captain's turn. On reaching the deck, our tipsy wardens were immediately seized up to the rigging, and a round dozen administered upon the back of each in decided unison, the captain all the while deploring the strictness of the naval code, which compelled him thus to punish every man who came on deck disguised with liquor.

William Hunt, formerly of Philadelphia, but the most extensive sugar planter in the island of Cuba, recently died. His will was opened on the 18th ult. in Philadelphia, when his nephew, William Hunt Stewart, was found to be sole heir to his immense possessions, which last year yielded \$110,000. This may safely be set down as annually worth \$90,000. This devise is charged with the payment of \$200,000 to legacies, and five years given for that purpose. Mr. Stewart is quite young, and may probably be the richest man of his age in the Union.

Great Triumph of the Floating Dock.—The huge ocean steamer Arctic, of Collins' new line, is now receiving her copper on the sectional floating dock in the East River. Her tonnage (3500 tons) is greater than that of any other ship in the world, and her length and beam are considerably greater than that of the United States ship-of-war Pennsylvania.

George R. Weinstein, associate editor and proprietor of the Louisville Courier, died on the 26th ult., of congestion of the brain, after an illness of two days.

BUGDALES' PATENT.

Moth-Proof Bee-Hive.

THE above Hive is admitted, wherever it comes to any eye offered to the public. It is a simple and effectual protection of the hives of the bee, and affords facilities for dividing the work, and honey and honey-comb; and, in short, for preserving the bees in a healthy and prosperous condition, and for securing every thing expected or desired by bee-culturists, far beyond those of any hive or hive heretofore constructed.

Bee-culturists, and all those desiring the introduction of the public of the best and most convenient hive ever constructed, are earnestly requested to examine this hive for themselves, and see if it is not all that it claims to be.

The following are a few of the many testimonials which might be given, showing the superiority of this Hive:—

Governor Ford's Testimony.—
I, the undersigned, having examined the patent Bee-Hive of Mr. J. B. Bugdale (J. A. Bugdale's name) most cheerfully and consider it the best hive ever constructed, and the most perfect of any thing of the kind which I have ever seen.

Burton, Ohio, Sept. 20, 1849.

From Professor Kirtland.
I, the undersigned, having examined the patent Bee-Hive of Mr. J. B. Bugdale (J. A. Bugdale's name) most cheerfully and consider it the best hive ever constructed, and the most perfect of any thing of the kind which I have ever seen.

Cleveland, Sept. 21, 1849.

Cuyahoga County Agricultural Society.
We, the undersigned, a committee appointed by the Cuyahoga County Agricultural Society, on mechanics hereby certify that we have examined the patent Bee-Hive of Mr. Daniel Bugdale (J. A. Bugdale's name), and do not hesitate to say, that it is the best hive ever constructed, and the most perfect of any thing of the kind which I have ever seen.

Signed by the Committee, this 6th day of Oct., 1849.
WILLIAM RUTHER,
NATHAN HARTMAN,
WM. MEERER.

At the Agricultural Fair in Trumbull County, Ohio, and also at Syracuse, New York, this Hive was declared by the committees authorized to decide, to be superior to all others.

Purchasers of rights will be furnished with all the necessary directions for constructing and using the Hive.

Family and township rights for Essex County, in this State, are for sale by the Editor of the Liberator. A good Agent is wanted for this purpose.

Great Cough Remedy!

WATER'S
CHERRY PECTORAL

For the Cure of
COUGHS, COLDS,
HOARSENESS, BRONCHITIS,
WHOPPING-COUGH, CROUP,
ASTHMA AND CONSUMPTION.

THE annals of medical science, affording as they do ample proof of the power and value of many medicinal agents, have furnished no examples to compare with the salutary effects produced by WATER'S CHERRY PECTORAL.

The remarkable cures of diseases of the lungs which have been realized by its use, attested as they are by many prominent professors and physicians in this and foreign lands, should encourage the effort to persevere, with the strong assurance that the use of the 'CHERRY PECTORAL' will relieve and ultimately cure them.

We present to the public: uncollected testimonials from some of the first men in our country, upon whose judgment and experience implicit confidence may be placed.

DR. PERKINS, President of Vermont Medical College, says:—

One of the most learned and intelligent physicians in the country, considers it a 'composition of rare excellence for the cure of that formidable disease, Consumption.'

Dr. J. C. Ayer—Dear Sir—Agreeably to the request of your agent, we will cheerfully state what we have known of the effects of your CHERRY PECTORAL